

ITEMS 1 & 2
06/05/20 PLANNING COMMITTEE

OLD HOUSE, NORTHEAD, BATHEASTON
PLANNING & LISTED BUILDING APPLICATIONS
19/0557/FUL & 19/05508/LBA

Chairman & Fellow Councillors,

Firstly we are the owners of the above property. We installed the new gates to make the whole entry safer for all and to enable accessible parking in our property. We have sustained ongoing damage to vehicles parked in the main road and were unable to safely maneuver and park under the previous arrangement at the site. We were incorrectly advised that planning permission and listed building consent for our gates had been granted in conjunction with a previous planning application at our property. This was incorrect.

Our retrospective planning and listed building applications were deferred at the 11th March Planning Committee Agenda for a member visit to view the application site and allow clarification over the discussion points raised at the committee meeting by Cllr Sarah Warren 'call in' and our planning consultant.

In essence these points related to the consideration of local councillor Warren's highlighted committee referral points over the '*public benefits*' of the proposals and whether the officer's recommendation takes proper account of the relevance of the existence of an identical gated treatment of our neighbour, the adjoining property (Valley View BA1 6NX), just to the north of the application site.

The approved Valley View & Old House gates are shown on your RECORDED VIDEO. We know this as we met with the Planning Officer taking the video. He acknowledged that the proposals invoke the same design, form, detail and material considerations as they front the same main road (North End) in the same rural landscape / same Green Belt context, same AONB context and involve the same highway benefits (B&NES Ref No. 11/01860/FUL). The last committee report was wrong in stating that this site is not within a Conservation Area.

The current situation relates to the consideration of a unique scenario as the gates at both properties are already built. Following Council requests to make the reinstated walling more rural it is our intention to further reduce the width of the Old House gates by a further 0.7 metres and make the adjoining walls more rustic to address Council concerns (See *Observations/Update 11.03.20*).

We appreciate that you have not visited but the local topography surrounding both our property and Valley View dictates that only limited oblique views of the new gates are afforded in their landscape context. The approved gates at Valley View are more visible than the Old House property as they are approximately double the size of the proposed Old House Gates. We are in

the process of implementing planting proposals at our proposals. However we know that vegetation screening afforded at Valley View and Old House properties is not a planning consideration as it could not be guaranteed in perpetuity.

The gates in both cases are not '*open & exposed*' as described by the Case Officer in her Observations/Update report 11.03.20. The land rises steeply on the opposite side of the road in the case of the Old House so that the gates are only visible in oblique short range and immediate views i.e. directly adjacent to the frontage of the site. There are no medium and long-range views which would be consistent with an open and exposed aspect. The Old House proposals are therefore directly comparable with Valley View.

The Valley View gates are not located adjacent to a listed building but they were approved on the basis that they allowed roadside car parking to be transferred to an onsite courtyard. This is the same situation as that at Old House where prior to the installation of the new sliding gate mechanism has enabled improved access for vehicles previously parked on the roadside outside our house. The Old House originally had a pair of unsightly large white metal gates, which restricted parking and associated turning movements.

Your RECORDED VIDEO shows that the proposed new gates at Old House are set against the modern extended section of the listed building rather than its older principal elevations. Under the relevant planning legislation relating to listed buildings any public benefits associated with the proposals should be offset against the minimal impact on the setting of the listed building.

We fundamentally refute that the proposals bring no public benefits to highway safety on Northend. These are clearly acknowledged by the local member who lives close to the site and your own highway officer has confirmed that this would be case. His department don't object to the application. We have checked the situation and Valley View already had limited off street parking before their gates were approved.

We want to make clear that the entry arrangement has been installed at our property to make the entry safer, it makes it much easier to turn than with the previous metal gate arrangement and directly prevents the requirement for on street parking on a very narrow section of this lane which regularly floods. As we have already confirmed that the new gated arrangement will enable 4-5 home and visitor parking spaces onsite to prevent parking on the street. These weren't available previously and this is why we made made the changes !

The proposals are fully supported by Batheaston Parish Council and in other third party responses which only highlight the public benefits of our proposals.

It is unexplainable to us why the Case Officer seems to be going out of her way to dismiss the comparability of this proposal with the Valley Farm gates. These gates were originally dismissed as not having received planning

consent but the position has changed. Despite our property being a Grade II listed building the public benefits must be taken into account in the planning balance.

In the above circumstances we respectfully request that our highlighted points are fully considered in tandem with the full support of the referring local member (who is unable to attend or log in) and the benefits acknowledged by the local community. If this is refused you will leave us with no option but to go to planning appeal to make the same relevant points over again.

Thank you

Mr. & Mrs. C Humphrey